

REMARKS


This is in response to the official action dated December 17, 2003. Reconsideration in view of the following is respectfully requested.

The examiner objected to the drawings, for not showing the two separate covers of claim 5. This is now shown in a new Fig. 9, with Fig. 7 amended accordingly to show how the view of Fig. 9 is to be taken. The specification has been amended to refer to new Fig. 9. Therefore, the objection should be withdrawn.

The claims are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In claim 1, applicant has replaced 'suitable film or other material' with a 'suitable film material'. The skilled artisan would know that there are many such film materials to choose from in forming a blister. Likewise, the skilled artisan would know of suitable materials which may be used for the cover (36), and the specific list of materials has been deleted. The manner in which the cover may be opened has been amended to read in functional terms, i.e. "to allow access to the components", as the skilled artisan will understand. The phrase "at least approximately" has been replaced by "generally", which is sufficiently definite for the skilled artisan. The claims has also been amended to address antecedent basis issues.

Wherefore, allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Bruce S. Londa (33,531)
Attorney for Applicant
Norris, McLaughlin & Marcus P.A.
220 East 42nd Street, 30th Floor
New York, N.Y. 10017
Telephone: 212-808-0700
Facsimile: 212-808-0844